

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 11/08/2004

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/829,879	04/10/2001	Seon Huh	SUN-0010	7396	
23413	7590 11/08/2004		EXAM	EXAMINER	
CANTOR COLBURN, LLP 55 GRIFFIN ROAD SOUTH			BONSHOCK, DENNIS G		
BLOOMFIE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2173		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action	09/829,879	HUH, SEON			
,	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Dennis G. Bonshock	2173			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress		
THE REPLY FILED 08 September 2004 FAILS TO PLA Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appel Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applications to the same of t	cation. A proper report for places the application of the contraction	ply to a cation in		
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]				
a) The period for reply expires 3_months from the mailing date of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adv event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later th ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	isory Action, or (2) the date set forth in th an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o	f the final rejection.	•		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dathave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extensions of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three more earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding amount of the I statutory period for reply originally set in	e fee. The appropriate ex the final Office action; or	tension fee under (2) as set forth in		
1 A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF					
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b	ecause:				
(a) they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search ((see NOTE below);			
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);					
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	terially reducing or s	simplifying the		
(d) they present additional claims without cancel NOTE:	ing a corresponding number of	finally rejected clain	ms.		
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ction(s):				
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely file	d amendment		
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request fo application in condition for allowance because: See		sidered but does NO	OT place the		
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	ere newly		
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w			and an		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:					
Claim(s) allowed:					
Claim(s) objected to: <u>8-13</u> .					
Claim(s) rejected: 1-7 and 14.					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>15 and 16</u> .					
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app		the Examiner.			
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)					
10. ☐ Other:					
		JOHN CABE	CA		
	∪ s	UPERVISORY PATENT TECHNOLOGY GENE	EXAM**		

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: There are new limitations in the independent claim that would require further consideration before a determination on allowability can be made. With respect to the arguemnt presented that Ichimura in combination with Maeda don't teach writing pre-stored information of a lecture file and input information together with a graphic tool or sequentially writing the information of the lecuture file together with the shape of graphic tool, in order to prevent flicker", the office maitains it stance as presented in the final office action.